



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,173	01/30/2004	Sherman (Xuemin) Chen	15415US01	7811
23446 7590 06/10/2009 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
PALIWAL, YOGESH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2435				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/769,173

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

YOGESH PALIWAL

Art Unit

2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's amendment filed on 03/02/2009 has been entered. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 21 and 32. Currently claims 1-41 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/2/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for following reasons:

- Applicant argues that, "More specifically, referring to Applicant's Fig. 6A, the digitally signed secure keys 638 are encrypted by the encryptor 608. The encrypted and signed secure keys 632 are looped back via the registers 610 and then communicated back (628 and 630) to the encryptor 608 for purposes of encrypting the next digitally signed secure key. Obviously, the digitally signed secure keys and the encrypted digitally signed secure keys are of the same type, the difference being that the latter have been encrypted and then looped back for purposes of using them during encryption of subsequent signed secure keys."
- Examiner respectfully disagrees and still maintains that even Fig. 6A does not support applicant interpretation that requires secure key and key that encrypts the secure key to be of same type. See paragraph 0047 (originally filed specification) that recites " In accordance with an aspect of the present invention, the **master decryption keys 618** may be utilized in the

encryption and decryption of one or more secure keys, for example, a **work key and/or a scrambling key**." Also note that claim 6 recites, "wherein if the secure key comprises a work key then a decrypted digitally signed master key at the second location is utilized for **decrypting** an encrypted digitally signed work key.". This claim clearly establishes that when the secure key is a work key it has to be encrypted by the master key. Also see, claim 7 which recites, " wherein if the secure key comprises a scrambling key then a decrypted digitally signed work key at the second location is utilized for **decrypting** an encrypted digitally signed scrambling key". Examiner realizes that Fig. 6A in fact shows that after encrypting the secure key do go back to encrypt the next secure keys however, as recited at paragraph 0047 and claims 6 and 7, if the work key is looped back then it will encrypt the content key. Therefore, applicant's interpretation that secure key and key that encrypts the secure key to be of same type is not consistent with the specification and dependent claims 6 and 7. Nowhere in the specification it is recited that same level keys are encrypted using the same level keys as argued by the applicant. Also note that the current claim language does not raise rejection under U.S.C. 112 first paragraph for lacking the written description because at least one interpretation (one taken by the examiner) is supported by the specification. Examiner is interpreting the current language of the claim such that as long as the key that encrypt the secure key is also a secure key it reads onto the claimed limitation. Further note that even though

applicant is interpreting secure key and key that encrypts the secure key to be of **same type** the current language of the claim is broad enough that as long as the key that encrypt the secure key is also secure it would read onto the claims limitation. Further note that applicant's statement that "Obviously, the digitally signed secure keys and the encrypted digitally signed secure keys are of the same type, the difference being that the latter have been encrypted and then looped back for purposes of using them during encryption of subsequent signed secure keys" appears to be an opinion because there is no written description that requires these keys to be of **same type**. As clearly shown by paragraph 0047 and claims 6 and 7, key that encrypts the digitally signed key is chosen based on what is the type of the digitally signed key is for example if the digitally signed key is work key then master key is used to encrypt the digitally signed key and if the digitally signed key is a scrambling key then work keys are used to encrypt the digitally signed key (see, paragraph 0041 and claims 6 and 7).

- Applicant further argues that, "In this regard, Akiyama does not disclose that the work keys (equated by the Examiner to Applicant's "secure key") are encrypted utilizing a previously generated unreadable digitally signed and encrypted work key, where the previously generated unreadable digitally signed and encrypted work key was generated by encrypting a previously generated signed work key. In other words, Akiyama does not disclose that the work keys are encrypted using previously generated work keys, as recited

in Applicant's claim 1. Ellison does not overcome the above deficiencies of Akiyama."

- In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the work keys are encrypted using previously generated work keys") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Examiner is interpreting the current language of the claim such that as long as the key that encrypt the secure key is also a secure key, it reads onto the claimed limitation. Since the master key of Akiyama is only provided to the subscriber through smart cards, the master key of Akiyama is in fact a "secure key". Claim language does not require the key that encrypts the secure key to be of same type. Therefore, the combination of Akiyama and Ellison still discloses all the limitations and the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama (US 2002/0001386) in view of Ellison (US 6,073,237), hereinafter Ellison.

Regarding **Claim 1**, Akiyama discloses a method for secure key authentication, the method comprising:

generating at a first location (Fig.29, This is a broadcast station where the contents, keys and digital signature for contact information etc, are generated and then sent to receivers) a digital signature (Fig. 5, "Digital signature") of a secure key to obtain a digitally signed secure key (Fig. 5, "work keys", also at paragraph 0107, "The digital signature is information used to check the authenticity of the contract information, and is used to prevent tampering.", also at paragraph 0107, "The contract information is made up of, e.g., a receiver ID, channel contract information, the number n of work keys, n pairs of work keys and work key identifiers, and digital signature").

encrypting the digitally signed secure key utilizing at least a previously generated unreadable secure key (Fig. 7, "Enciphered contract information", also at Paragraph 0106, lines 5-8, "The individual control packet is comprised of an information identifier, master key identifier, and encrypted contract information, as shown in FIG. 7.", Note: *[Each digitally signed contract information is encrypted using and master key, also note that master keys are generated and sent to clients via secure card therefore master keys are generated prior to encrypting work keys and it is also unreadable and also secure because only broadcaster and receivers have the master key (see Paragraph 0154)]*

and transmitting the digitally signed and encrypted secure key from the first location (Paragraph 0167, "The transmission processing operation of an individual control packet by the information distributor apparatus shown in FIG. 29..."). Note: individual control packets contains encrypted contract information (Paragraph 0106, "The individual control packet is comprised of an information identifier, master key identifier, and encrypted contract information, as shown in FIG. 7."), and as established above, contract information contains work keys, as a result, when control packet is transmitted, it contains the signed work keys as well, and thus we can interpret that signed work keys are transmitted from a broadcast device depicted in Fig. 29).

Akiyama discloses encrypting work keys with master key. Akiyama does not disclose that the master key is also encrypted and digitally signed and wherein said previously generated unreadable digitally signed and encrypted key (master key) was generated by encrypting a previously generated digitally signed secure key (master key) as now required by claim limitation.

However, using PKI system to encrypt and digitally signing the keys are well known technique in the art of cryptography, which enable secure transmission of keys over unsecured channels using asymmetric key encryption. Ellison, in the same field of endeavor of network security, discloses encrypting and digitally signing a key wherein encryption of the key takes place after digitally signing the key (Column 4, lines 64-67, **"The session key K_x is signed by private key of the server itself K_n 121 and encrypted by the public key of the user $P1e$."** The encrypted and signed session key K_x is then sent back to the user 123, further note that since the encryption of session

key K_x is taking place before the encryption, it reads on to the amended claim limitation that requires key to be encrypted and digitally signed wherein the digitally signed and encrypted key was generated by encrypting a digitally signed key).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to add, on the master key of Akiyama, a digital signature utilizing a private key of a broadcast station and then encrypt the digitally signed key with the public key of the receiver, as taught by Ellison. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so because digital signature provides authentication and encryption provides secrecy. As a result, when the broadcast station updates the master key, it could utilize PKI technique to send new master key over an unsecured channel with fully confidentiality without having to provide each receiver a new smart card having a new master key.

Regarding **Claim 2**, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses generating the digital signature from at least one of an asymmetric encryption algorithm and a symmetric encryption algorithm (Paragraph 0111, lines 9-10, "authenticates the digital signature using key information (secret key or public key) stored in a digital signature")

Regarding **Claim 3**, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and the combination of Akiyama and Ellison discloses encrypting the digitally signed secure key prior to transmission utilizing at least an encrypted master key, to obtain the digitally signed and encrypted secure key (Fig. 7, "Enciphered contract information", also at Paragraph 0106, lines 5-8, "The individual control packet is comprised of an information identifier,

master key identifier, and encrypted contract information, as shown in FIG. 7.") *[Each digitally signed contract information is encrypted using and master key, and Ellison discloses, as established in the rejection of claim 1 above, the limitation of encrypting a master key]*

Regarding **Claim 4**, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses the secure key comprises at least one of a master key, a work key and a scrambling key. (Fig. 5, "Work keys")

Regarding **Claim 5**, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses the receiving the digitally signed and encrypted secure key at a second location (**Paragraph 0110, lines 1-2, "Upon receiving an individual packet via the public telephone network and modem 101..."**)

decrypting the digitally signed and encrypted secure key to obtain a decrypted digitally signed secure key (Paragraph 0110, Lines 11-17, "If the master key identifier matches the master key, that master key is output from the master key storage 103 (step S4) to decrypt contract information in the individual information packet")

Regarding **Claim 6**, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses if the secure key comprises a work key then a decrypted digitally signed master key at the second location is utilized for decrypting an encrypted digitally signed work key (Paragraph 0110, Lines 11-17, "If the master key identifier matches the master key, that master key is output from the master key storage 103 (step S4) to decrypt contract information in the individual information packet (step S5). Work key information

(pairs of work key identifiers and work keys and the like) contained in the decrypted contract information is stored in a work key storage 105")

Regarding **Claim 7**, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses if the secure key comprises a scrambling key then a decrypted digitally signed work key at the second location is utilized for decrypting an encrypted digitally signed scrambling key (Paragraph 0125, lines 9-14, "If the work key can be acquired, information of an encrypted section in the common control packet is decrypted using the work key (step S44). A channel key Kch is acquired from the decrypted information, and is stored in the channel key storage 118")

Regarding **Claim 8**, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses verifying authenticity of the digital signature of the digitally signed secure key (Paragraph 0112, line 1-2, "digital signature authentication process")

Regarding **Claim 9**, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses verifying the authenticity of the digital signature utilizing at least one of an asymmetric decryption algorithm and a symmetric decryption algorithm (Paragraph 0111, lines 7-11, "the contract information certifying device 107 certifies or authenticates the digital signature using key information (secret key or public key) stored in a digital signature authentication key storage 108")

Regarding **Claim 10**, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses determining whether to verify authenticity of the digital signature (Paragraph 0111, lines 6-8, "If the two IDs match, the contract information certifying device 107 certifies or authenticates the digital signature using key information")

Claims **11, 21 and 32** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 1. Akiyama in the same reference discloses a system for performing method of claim 1 [Broadcast receiver is depicted in figure 1 and Transmitter system is depicted in figure 29]. Also, it should be noted that since Akiyama's system discloses the hardware to perform the method of claim 1, therefore it would also have computer software that performs the method of claim 1. Claims 11, 21 and 32 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 1.

Claims **12, 22 and 33** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 2. Claims 12, 22 and 32 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 2.

Claims **13, 23 and 34** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 3. Claims 13, 23 and 34 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 3.

Claims **14, 24 and 35** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 4. Claims 14, 24 and 35 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 4.

Claims **15, 25 and 36** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 5. Claims 15, 25 and 36 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 5.

Claims **16, 26 and 37** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 6. Claims 16, 26 and 37 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 6.

Claims **17, 27 and 38** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 7. Claims 17, 28 and 38 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 7.

Claims **18, 28 and 39** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 8. Claims 18, 28 and 39 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 8.

Claims **19, 29 and 40** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 9. Claims 19, 29 and 40 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 9.

Claims **20, 30 and 41** are "computer program" and "system" claims analogous to "method" claim 10. Claims 20, 30 and 41 are rejected under same rationale as the rejection of claim 10.

Regarding **Claim 31**, rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and further Akiyama discloses at least one processor comprises at least one of a host processor, a microprocessor, and a microcontroller (Figure 29, processor used in the system of Fig. 29 is a host processor).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOGESH PALIWAL whose telephone number is (571)270-1807. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,173
Art Unit: 2435

Page 14

/Y. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2435

/Beemnet W Dada/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435